

THE ABOLITIONIST

A Publication of the Radical Libertarian Alliance

Has not the experience of centuries shown that gradualism in theory is perpetuity in practice?

—William Lloyd Garrison

VOLUME II NUMBER 6

SEPTEMBER 1971

35 cents

THE MERIDEN STATEMENT

—A CALL TO ACTION

It has now been two years since the YAF convention in St. Louis, during which libertarianism was established as an independent force. Since then libertarians have expended their energies primarily on educational activities — books, articles, debating sessions, even quixotic speculation on the efficacy of violent revolution. All this has been essential for the building of a theoretical base — an ideological platform broad enough to support the various factions within the libertarian movement.

Now it is time to move into Phase Two of our operation. While we will continue our educational efforts, we are also moving into the area of concrete political activity. Toward this end we offer a moderate proposal which should prove acceptable to every libertarian worthy of the name: the removal of Richard Nixon from the Presidency. We recognize the fact that the American state and all its corporate trappings is not going to fall tomorrow or in the foreseeable future. At the same time we believe in trying to improve the present political, social and cultural atmosphere, and the dumping of Nixon in 1972 will be a small step in this direction while we continue to work for our long-range goal of total voluntarism.

The removal of Nixon necessitates our active involvement in electoral politics. Let us understand that reform politics can never be an end in itself, but merely part of an overall strategy involving education, reform and revolutionary tactics. Reform politics is an attempt to "libertarianize" society as much as it is possible to do so within the system. We therefore intend to work for any candidate, regardless of party, who promises to end all U.S. hostilities in Southeast Asia, terminate the military draft, restore basic civil liberties, and labor on behalf of political decentralization.



Would you buy a used war
from this man?

The groundwork for this approach is currently being laid through the creation of a libertarian front group, Citizens for a Restructured Republic. In cooperation with Allard Lowenstein's Dump Nixon campaign, Citizens for Local Democracy, and other reform-decentralist organizations, we hope to provide the type of analysis and commitment necessary to defeat Nixon and elect someone else more compatible with our own principles.

We request the support of libertarians in these efforts to work at the local level for a candidate opposed to Nixon.

IN THIS ISSUE. . .

Meriden Statement (p. 1)

Richter on RLA Organizers Busted (p. 2)

Danks on Liberation Struggle in
Hawaii (p. 3)

Halbrook on Anarchism and Revolution
in Africa (p. 5)

Jerome Tuccille
Ralph Fucetola
John Brotschol
William Baumgarth

Meriden, Connecticut
Independence Day, 1971

Abigail Goldsmith
Priscilla Caplan
Frank Richter
Walter Block
Geoffrey Hall

RLA ORGANIZERS BUSTED ON PHONY DRUG CHARGES!

by Frank X. Richter

I was reading George Orwell's *1984* late Thursday evening (July 29th) when the phone rang. I'd just passed the scene in which Winston Smith and Julia are busted for crimethink. I put the book down, and grabbed the phone.

"Frank, it's Abby Goldsmith. I don't think I can make the *Abolitionist* staff meeting this month. Mike and I have been busted."

"What for?"

"Iron pills, mostly." She sounded frustrated, her voice wavering on the thin boundary between laughing and crying.

"Iron pills? What's *that* supposed to mean?" (For a split second I wondered whether our Meriden Connecticut RLA chapter had discovered a new high.)

"What it means is that this evening, around 10 P.M., the pigs broke in, messed the place up and confiscated" —she paused, perhaps to swallow her indignation, perhaps because she still couldn't believe it had happened.

"Confiscated *what* Abby?" I was really curious. Somehow I knew that this was no run of the mill bust.

"They confiscated the spices off my kitchen shelf, the sugar from our table, and the entire contents of our medicine cabinet. They wouldn't let us put the kids to bed. Just made us sit at the kitchen table, with the four kids, while they tore the whole damn house apart. I can't believe it. What pigs! This place looks like a bomb hit it." She paused.

"What did they find?" I still was in the dark.

"I told you: spices—rosemary and oregano to be exact, sugar, aspirins, iron capsules, some vitamins, I think. I don't know. Could you tell me, exactly, what *you've* got in *your* medicine cabinet? Just some pills. Prescribed pills. Mostly iron and anti-biotics."

"Hey, Abby, they can't bust you for prescribed drugs. There's no law against medicine." I wondered if she was putting me on.

"Well, we've just had to pay \$1000 to get out on bail. I'm told we've committed a felony—a federal offense." Her voice hung dead on the line. She wasn't kidding. For a second I thought I was going to throw up.

"I've got to go now. This is a long distance call. After laying out so much cash tonight I don't want to ring up the bill. I'll send you people down a full report for the *Abolitionist*." She sounded eager to get back to her beleaguered family.

"Abby, 1984 is here, isn't it?" I didn't know what else I could say.

"Take it slow." She hung up.

It isn't illegal to own a medicine cabinet. Or spices. Or sugar. But in Orwell's "Oceania" it wasn't illegal to study the works of Emmanuel Goldstein either. Not illegal. In *1984* nothing was "illegal." The due process of law had vanished. What reigned was brute force exercised by a lawless state in the name of *goodthink*, to display the slightest disagreement with the principles of *Ingsoc*, above all to practice individualism or *ownlife* was to court disaster. But 1984 is a long way off.

Perhaps Meriden Connecticut is fourteen years ahead of its time.

Item 1: Mike and Abby Goldsmith organized the Meriden Radical Libertarian Alliance several months ago. Not content with armchair philosophy, they started putting out *The New Peaceful Revolutionist*, a mimeo newsletter, dealing with town problems from a predominantly anarchist perspective. They invited all Meriden dissidents to think of the NPR as "their" newspaper. Articles started to flow in. High school kids sick of their enslavement to the State school system wrote for the NPR. Ecology buffs wrote for NPR. Active duty G.I.'s wrote for the NPR. Mike and Abby handed out the newsletter at public meetings, shopping centers, everywhere. In no time, they acquired a reputation we can all envy: they were known to be anarchists, enemies of the state.

Item 2: On Memorial Day this year, Mike, Abby, their four kids, Abby's sister Cilla Caplan and myself attended the Meriden Parade. We weren't going to let this event, designed to honor American war dead, be used by the State to whip up the patriotic fever that causes wars in the first place. Accordingly, we wore black arm-bands of mourning, bore peace signs on our backs, handed out RLA literature, and joined some fifty other people in a sitdown in front of the town hall. Amid jeers and catcalls, we bore witness to the lie that is Amerika. A heckler called us "faggots." Abby turned to a cop standing nearby. "If we used language like that," she noted, "you'd bust us." The cop smiled, "Damn right sister."

Item 3: The Meriden Radical Libertarian Alliance tried to lend its support to other progressive groups in the town. When a bunch of neighborhood long-haired kids tried to set up "Free People Inc.," a storefront to help drug addicts and other kids in trouble, the Goldsmiths pitched in their labor. When the Board of Health of Meriden tried to stop the storefront from operating, the Meriden libertarians recognized the board's scheme for the cultural oppression that it was. Abby and Mike were able to gain the trust and respect of the "Free People," who felt free to visit the Goldsmiths to discuss local problems, coordinate activities, and broaden their knowledge of the libertarian cause. On more than one occasion the Goldsmiths had to brave neighbors who didn't dig the "scruffy characters" from the storefront.

Item 4: On July 4th, the Goldsmiths held a gala Independence Day Party. Meriden RLA'ers, libertarians from Hartford, RLA'ers from New York and New Jersey, a number of radical high school kids, and some of the Storefront people attended. Our own Peter Sherman could testify to the abusive attitude of some of the Goldsmith's neighbors. Pete, soon to obtain his doctorate in economics, and hardly a Hell's Angel type, was roundly berated—apparently for the unpardonable crime of driving a motorcycle. The day after the party, a "friend" called to ask if Abby had invited "all those ridiculous looking people over just to annoy" her.

Item 5: During the Independence Day Party, it was announced that the RLA had formed the Citizens for a Restructured Republic, designed to assert effective political pressure of a libertarian bent (see the Meriden Statement in this issue). Abby announced as well that she planned to run for mayor of Meriden, with the backing of the CRR. An official CRR organizing meeting

continued on page 8

KOKUA HAWAII:

ALL LAND TO THE PEOPLE!

Ua Mau Ke Ea Ka Aina I Ka Pono.

The Life of the Land is Perpetuated in Righteousness.

—State Seal of Hawaii.

Famous are the children of Hawaii, ever loyal to the land.

When the evil-hearted messenger comes with his greedy document of extortion—no one will fix a signature to the paper of the enemy.

—an 1893 song opposing U.S. annexation.

by William Danks

Of all the liberation struggles currently taking place, the one in Hawaii has probably received the least amount of media coverage, both from the underground and straight sources. But there is a struggle happening in the islands and the struggle is growing all the time. In common with most other revolutionary movements the Hawaiian one consists of a broadly based coalition aligned against U.S. imperialism, war, racism, political repression, and the power structure. Its most important focus at this time, however, is on land. Bringing to mind analogies to the Black Muslims, the Alcatraz Indians, and Tijerina's early Alianza and the current La Raza, Hawaiians are demanding land on which to live their lives.

In Hawaii, as in much of the rest of the country, very little land belongs to the people. Of the state's four million acres: 39% belongs to the state government, 10% to the federal government, 47% to the "Big Five" statist-monopoly corporations, and only 4% to individual small land owners.[1] In addition, of course, even this tiny fraction of the land is only conditionally controlled by the people. Their property is constantly at the mercy of their rulers who can at any time rip it off by eminent domain. Each year the people must ransom their lands by paying high property taxes to the ruling elite, taxes that enable the rulers to live better as they build the strength of their political exploitation machine. And if the people cannot or (increasingly) *will not* pay their taxes? Then their land goes first to the government and then on to the Big Five who can buy it up for the price of the unpaid back taxes.

A little history shows the people's major complaints.[2] American missionaries first came to Hawaii in 1820. A popular saying goes that, "they came to do good, but instead did very well." Within a generation nearly a third of all Hawaiians were members of the Protestant church. In less than a generation, missionary leaders like Gerrit Judd, William Richards, and Hiram Bingham were firmly entrenched in the government. One of the chief levers of their strength was the office of prime minister, which Judd held from 1842 to 1854. It was from this position that the foundation was laid for today's Big Five control of nearly half the land.

In 1848 Judd was able to use his influence, and the scare tactics of supposedly impending imperialist moves by France and England, to have the King pass the Great Mahele or land division.[3] This supposed property "reform" meant little to the people who were content with the feudal/communal use rights to the land that they had enjoyed for centuries. But it was a boon to the *haloe* (white) elite who were given the opportunity to snatch up as much land as they wanted. The *Mahele* established a private



property system that was alien to the culture and generally misunderstood by most Hawaiians. Like some American Indian tribes, the Hawaiians felt that in selling their property to the whites they were still retaining their own rights to cultivation and living space. Their past experiences had never been different.

Under such conditions it wasn't long before the *haloes* had acquired most of the non-governmental lands— frequently buying up multi-acred lots for a few dollars or a small supply of consumer goods. In addition, those close to the administration were able to get grants of fee-simple property for nothing. State influence was also widely used to obtain all kinds of monopolies on transportation, banking, trade, etc.

After the Civil War, sugar became a major industry in Hawaii and the politically astute *haloes* devoted thousands of acres of the best land to the crop. Due to the effects of foreign diseases such as syphilis, leprosy, smallpox, and cholera, the native Hawaiian population had declined by nearly 90% in less than a century. To offset this shortage in the supply of dark-skinned laborers willing to work in the fields for subsistence wages, the sugar planters imported workers from the Orient— first Chinese, later Japanese, and finally Filipinos. This helped create the multi-racial society of today's Hawaii. It also created a large non-white majority that was almost totally without land of their own. Such a group could become dangerous, despite the strong economic hegemony enjoyed by the ruling elite. What was needed was even stronger power of a purely *political* nature.

The control generated through infiltration and dominance of the local government had been effective in its time, but as the economy grew to truly "big business" proportions, a correspondingly larger political structure was required. Since the majority of *haloes* were either Americans or of American descent, the obvious goal they sought was alliance with the American government.

The previously mentioned fear of French and English imperialism had led to the framing of an early treaty of annexation to the U.S., which was fortunately not adopted. By playing France, England, and the U.S. off against each other, the Hawaiian kings had been able to nullify the efforts of local American expansionists who were pushing hard for annexation. But this only delayed the inevitable. On January 17, 1893 the

continued on following page

ANARCHISM AND REVOLUTION IN BLACK AFRICA

by Stephen P. Halbrook

Black Africa has a centuries old anarchist tradition. After years of imperialist aggression which led to the complete carving up of the continent in the hands of the white master race, this tradition was temporarily harnessed. As a part of the "free world," the ancient liberties of Africans were smashed while the attempt was made to impose upon them white dictatorships in the Western tradition. But the eternal spirit of rebellion is irrepressible, and frequently "the natives get restless." Three of the most significant recent cases of these occasions are: the Mau Mau, the Biafran Revolution, and the current liberation movement in "Portuguese" Guinea.

The Mau Mau Revolution was one of the greatest upheavals in African history. It was the expression of centuries of anarchism and resistance to authoritarianism among the Kikuyu people, the native inhabitants of Kenya. Except for parts of Uganda, which had a system of hereditary despotic chiefs, all of the East African tribes lived in radically democratic societies prior to the coming of the white man.[1] Originally ruled by a king, centuries ago the Kikuyu through popular rebellion literally abolished the State, substituting a voluntary society. According to Jomo Kenyatta, a founder of Mau Mau, the new system had such rules as: "Socially and politically all circumcised men and women should be equally full members of the tribe, and thereby the status of a king or nobleman should be abolished." It consisted of a federation of councils, beginning with the members of the family (the basic economic unit of land ownership), extending to the village and then the district, and ending on a national level. The right to recall representatives at the different councils was absolute; "in fact, it was the voice of the people or public opinion that ruled the country." The Kikuyu stateless society "continued to function favorably until it was smashed by the British government, which introduced a system of government very similar to the autocratic government which the Kikuyu people had discarded many centuries ago." The British imperialists appointed chiefs to overlord the people and set up a tyranny resting on centralization. Kenyatta helped form Mau Mau to destroy this, for: "In the eyes of the Kikuyu people, the submission to a despotic rule of any particular man or a group, white or black, is the greatest humiliation to mankind." [2]

The Kikuyu anarchist tradition which culminated in the Mau Mau Revolution has been best described by Donald L. Barnett and Karari Njama in, *Mau Mau From Within: An Analysis of Kenya's Peasant Revolt* [3], the latter author being a major participant; virtually all other works on the subject were written by white racist sycophants of British imperialism. Early in the work Barnett queries:

Were there, it might now be asked, any peculiar features of traditional Kikuyu society which help explain this peoples' independent response and, ultimately, revolutionary reaction to colonial rule and white dominance? The answer, I believe, is in the affirmative. It centers around two closely related aspects of Kikuyu society which were fundamentally incompatible with the imposed colonial system and conditioned an independent

response to it. The first of these, a decentralized and democratic political system, fostered among the Kikuyu a deep-seated suspicion of the highly centralized, authoritarian system imposed by the British and a tendency to reject the legitimacy and resist the dictates of the latter. The second, an age-grade system wherein leadership emerged on the basis of demonstrated personal qualities such as skill, wisdom and ability, underlay the Kikuyu rejection of British-appointed 'chiefs' and tendency to by-pass the latter and organize independent associations under popular leaders when the occasion arose to seek a redress of grievances.

Barnett goes on to explain in detail the Kikuyu stateless society. There was no "unitary or centralized political structure," and "within the Kikuyu sub-tribes political power was held by a number of fairly small and semi-autonomous geopolitical groupings." Disputes were settled and common affairs deliberated on by spontaneously formed councils. Each council elected a *muthamaki*, who had no personal power, unlike the life-term, salaried chiefs the British later imposed. "As the spokesman of a ridge council or *ad hoc bururi council*, a *muthamaki* was not a 'chief' in either the conventional or anthropological sense. He was the chairman and representative of a body which reached decisions through discussion and consensus and owed its authority to lower-level councils."

In brief, we have seen that the traditional Kikuyu political structure was decentralized and inherently democratic, with effective decision-making and enforcement powers resting for the most part in numerous local hierarchies of councils within each sub-tribe. We have noted, with respect to this kiama or council system, that: (1)councils were convened as the occasion demanded and reached decisions on the principle of 'discussion until unanimity was achieved,' (2)the particular council convened (sub-clan, village, neighborhood, etc.) was determined in each case by the scope and nature of the question or dispute at issue; (3)composition was based on the principle of 'lower-level representation on higher-level councils,' with the latter owing their authority to the former; (4)the spokesman or muthamaki of a given council, whether that of the village or the ridge—which represented the largest fixed administrative unit—was responsible to and acted in the name and with the approval of the entire body; and (5)positions of leadership were achieved, within a system of age-grades or ranks, rather than ascribed and were limited in duration by the periodic accession to political authority of junior generation-sets. [4]

The British imperialists, great "civilizers" that they were, imposed upon the Kikuyu the opposite extreme of totalitarian statism and economic and political slavery. Centralized, dictatorial rule was enstated, and the basic freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and the such were suppressed. Economic freedom was a luxury only for whites. The Kikuyu's land was seized for the use of white settlers and to force the blacks to work as wage slaves; compulsory labor and taxation supplemented this, as the colonial administrators openly admitted, as well as provided free construction and education funds for the privileged whites. Huge unused forest reserves were held out of production from which the black masses were not

continued on following page

continued from preceding page

annexationists staged a coup, and with the help of U.S. marines, landed by the sympathetic American minister John L. Stevens, were able to successfully end the Hawaiian monarchy and establish a provisional government.

They were temporarily frustrated in their attempt to be immediately annexed by America. In Washington the Cleveland administration did nothing. But expansionism was on the rise, and by 1898 the McKinley republicans, using the Manifest Destiny fervor of the Spanish-American War, managed to have Congress pass a joint resolution of annexation on July 7th.

Modern historians [4] realize that the motives of the sugar magnates were a compound of desires for economic manipulation and the philosophic conviction that they were really American patriots working for "good" government (i.e., non-Hawaiian) and the cause of America expanding to its "rightful" imperial size.

During the first half of the 20th century, the Big Five oligopoly of today was developed and consolidated. A beginning was made towards development of a radical labor movement to break the political and economic (actually the same thing in a mixed economy) stranglehold on the people. But this movement was stillborn, and in its place developed a typical Old Left reactionary union movement that today exerts tremendous power in the islands, since it has long since sold out the people and become a full partner with the Big Five and the politicians. The only labor organization *not* a part of the ruling establishment is a very tiny IWW printer's local.

In 1959 Hawaii became Amerika's 50th state, thus concluding a century-long drive towards total statism. Except for more taxes, statehood meant nothing to the people—but it meant everything to the rulers. Hawaii had finally become part of the Free World Colossus, a shareholder of Imperialism Inc., a paid-up member of the Liberal Corporate Fascist Society. The rulers were happy. From the governor to the union bosses to the Big Five boards, they rejoiced. While the people suffered.

Which brings us to today. And to revolution. After years of vigorous but generally futile activity by such groups as SDS, the Resistance, and (briefly) the Peace and Freedom Party, a new spirit of radical change began to be felt in late 1970. An organization was founded by Hawaiians. Its name was *Kokua* (help) *Hawaii*. Its goals—freedom, justice, and most importantly—Land! Its leaders were truly revolutionary, and truly heroic. Larry Kamakawiwoole: gentle and softspoken, fearless and proud, confident in the rightness of his cause, an efficient, constructive, effective liberator. Kalani Ohelo: tough speaking and tough thinking, a delegate to the Black Panthers' People's Revolutionary Convention, calling himself a "lumpen," saying, "what I'm advocating in the overthrow of the government."

Kokua Hawaii organizers went down to the grass roots in order to build their movement. They went into the streets and into the Hawaiian communities. They bravely faced the power of the establishment and the establishment-caused fear, apathy, alienation and conservatism of their own people. They were denounced as too radical and subversive by older Hawaiian groups. There was an attempt by the media to isolate *Kokua* from the people. There was the expected political backlash and repression. But the movement survived and grew. The people became less suspicious of the young revolutionaries, and began to realize as Larry Kamakawiwoole said, that "the opposite of radical isn't conservative, it's superficial." Slowly the rich but dormant soil of revolutionary consciousness among the people was being sowed and fertilized.

In 1971 a confrontation was shaping up in which *Kokua Hawaii* would play a decisive role. Pig farmers in Oahu's Kalama Valley were told to get off their land because a Kaiser-Aetna high rise development was planned for the area. Some left but others stayed on. The most militant and vocal resistor, George Santos, was given a court order telling him to be out of the valley by midnight on April 21st.

On April 19th *Kokua Hawaii* occupied the valley in a demonstration of support and solidarity with the residents. By the next night they were over 100 strong. First steps towards homesteading were made as land was cleared and gardening began, all a part of *Kokua Hawaii's* economic self-sufficiency program. The 21st came and went without incidence. The occupation continued for another two weeks. Finally, on May 7th Santos was served with a writ of summary possession, ordering him out of the valley within 48 hours. The people stood their ground. The 48 hours expired and nothing happened. The occupation forces diminished in numbers. Two days later 50 carloads of police sped into the valley, arrested 32 people and chased the rest out. The last hold-outs were brought down from the roof of Santos' house where they sat, passively resisting.

The Kalama 32 will soon be appearing in court to continue their struggle. *Kokua* chairman Kalani Ohelo has said of the affair, "The struggle in Kalama is a must. Deep inside, we local people have bitter feelings about institutions that kick us off our land for their profits. They do not care about us. If the Hawaiians had prices on their bodies, we would have been sold just like the Blacks long ago. Being a Hawaiian in Hawaii today is almost the same." Along with Santos, his pigs were also removed from the valley. As a result over 50 have died.

Community reaction was mixed on the Kalama Valley struggle. A growing number of Hawaiians were coming around to identifying with the goals of *Kokua Hawaii*. But others were turned off by what they felt could have been an avoidable conflict. Within a few weeks, however, new developments were to take place that would unify and radicalize even former conservatives.

A position was open on the Bishop Estate's board of trustees. This estate, set up through the will of a Hawaiian princess who had married into the *haloe* elite, was supposed to function as a source of revenue to educate Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian children. However, each of the trustees receive a salary of \$50,000 a year, *for life*—and are appointed by the state Supreme Court. Because of its close ties to both the Big Five and the government, the estate's board offers an excellent place to dispense patronage awards. The court appointed a non-Hawaiian, Matsuo Takabuke, to the post. Response from the Hawaiian community was immediate outrage and anger. Takabuke was a close friend of governor John Burns and was recognized as a member of the political-economic structure that controls the state. It was felt that his appointment was a reward for his support of Burns in the 1970 election.

Reverend Abraham Akaka, conservative leader of a large Hawaiian congregation, called a meeting at his church. Hundreds of incensed Hawaiians of all political persuasions showed up. Larry Kamakawiwoole of *Kokua Hawaii* spoke to the group and was very well received. He urged unity and determination to fight

THE ABOLITIONIST is published monthly by John Brotschol, Ralph Fucetola III, Vincent Ninelli, Steve Halbrook, Frank X. Richter, Peter Sherman. Contributors include Wally Conger, Bill Baumgarth, Geoffrey Hall, Roy Halliday, and Jerome Tuccille.

continued on page 8

continued from preceding page

even allowed to gather firewood. In 1936 the British ruled that squatters could only have one acre per wife, fifteen sheep or goats and no cattle, and there were all kinds of restrictions on the types of crops blacks could grow—all of this because the inefficient whites could not bear the competition of the efficient blacks. Government restrictions of every kind were enforced against blacks, from license fees to severe restrictions on freedom of movement. Blacks could not enforce contracts against whites, and were not allowed the right of inheritance or enforceable land titles, the better to keep them subjected to the white exploiters.

To a people so accustomed to complete freedom, such slavery was intolerable. Opposition was sporadic until the great peasant revolution of 1953-56, which set in motion the political forces which led to the lowering of that filthy Union Jack in Kenya in 1963. The anarchist heritage of the Kikuyu expressed itself not only in their willingness to bid for liberty or death, but also in the methods by which they carried out their tasks. As Barnett points out, there was "a considerable measure of continuity, at least as regards certain major patterns, between the traditional Kikuyu social system and the structure and organization of the underground movement and guerrilla forces which emerged within the colonial context." [5] The basic cells of Mau Mau were the local villages, in which everyone was used to cooperating for common tasks. The old council system, organized from the bottom up through consensual election of representatives, was reinstated. Local cell councils pressured the lingering to join mainly by the threat of ostracism. Popular support of Mau Mau is revealed in that up to 90% of the Kikuyu population took the Oath of Unity.

While there was a Central Committee at the top, it mainly coordinated action and expressed the policies the masses desired. In practice action was initiated by the local cells. In the first months there was no clear-cut division of labor, hierarchy of roles, or differential privileges, and leaders (who had no formal ranks) were selected by informal consensus. Later the Ituma Trinity Council was formed to give central direction to the movement; but, just as the power of the local leaders depended on the loyalty their warriors were willing to give them voluntarily, compliance with its recommendations depended on the decisions of the local groups. A similar institution was the Kenya Defense Council, which comprised the leaders of the forest guerrilla groups. Enforcement of this council's decisions, which were unanimously decided, depended on its members' individual persuasive abilities, and expressed a decentralization of power and authority.

These features of decentralization reflected the voluntary nature of both membership in and recognition of the Kenya Defense Council, as well as the prior distribution of effective power among groups whose members were bound together by strong leader-followers-locality ties and loyalties... [The relatively weak Council] was advantageous since without significantly altering the existing distributions of power amongst the various leaders, it allowed for a considerable degree of cooperation among the latter in the planning and coordination of policies, rules and tactics. Another advantage of this decentralization lay in its allowing for a very high degree of flexibility of maneuver and individual initiative among the many forest sections. [6]

Needless to say, the goal of Mau Mau was a return to the free economic and political institutions which characterized the Kikuyu before the coming of the imperialists, and it was fitting that their slogan was simply "Land and Freedom!" True, the

complete stateless society of former years has not yet been completely reinstated, but one must not expect miracles. Kenya has done away with the worst iniquities of the State, those imposed by the British; while continuing to head in the direction of the old libertarian traditions, progress is impeded by the facts that several of the "educated" Kenyans were brainwashed by statist ideologies of the British and that neo-colonialism continues. The liberation of the whole African continent is an indispensable condition for the complete liberation of the masses from black elites and neo-colonialism.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE ABOLITIONIST!

II

An almost identical situation occurred in the Biafran Revolution, so recently drowned in the blood of over two million dead Ibo tribesmen. The Ibo are the inhabitants of southern Nigeria, and like the Kikuyu traditionally lived in stateless societies. Basil Davidson explains their general situation thus:

The political systems of Africa, as we have already noted, did not always develop into forms of centralized and bureaucratic rule. Quite a number of peoples found it possible to do without any regular apparatus of government. They continued to live peacefully together, to defend themselves and enlarge their wealth, with the help of very little central authority. Among these peoples were the Ibo who live now, as they have lived since time beyond memory, in the fertile lands to the east of the lower reaches of the Niger river.

Does this mean that the Ibo and other peoples without chiefs or kings were any less successful than the peoples who elected chiefs and formed themselves into states with central governments? Far from it. Some of these peoples without chiefs repeatedly showed themselves, on the contrary, to be among the most go-ahead of all the peoples of Africa; very active in trade, very skillful in politics, very shrewd in dealing with their neighbors. [7]

The Ibo experience indicates that anarchism is possible in very densely populated areas. "To us, with our logic and our standards of size, it must seem that these thousands of little groups living, not dispersed, but very densely upon the soil, must have spelt anarchy. But... Ibo institutions catered with remarkable success for the basic needs of men in society." [8] The Ibo experience also shows that not having a state is a great defense from foreign aggression. "The reduction of this country was a struggle with a hydra. Almost every small group of this large population, sheltered by forest and river, had to be subjected individually." [9] When the Ibo finally succumbed to British aggression, the stateless tradition made it almost impossible to dominate this people, "who had been accustomed to settling most of their affairs within the family or kindred, and, more rarely, within slightly wider groups. Put into terms of administration, this means that among these four or five million people the points of effective contact between officers and people are to be counted not in tens, nor in hundreds, but in thousands." [10]

British imperialism attempted to impose upon all the peoples of Nigeria an untrammelled bureaucracy and an autocratic constitution. This worked in the North among the Emirs, who unlike the Ibo, had a state at the time of conquest; the British

continued on following page

continued from preceding page

merely seized this state and were easily able to consolidate their authority. This system of indirect-rule was bound to fail among the Ibo, who constituted the eastern half of the south. As Frederick Forsyth explains in his excellent work on Biafra:

The British were so concerned with the idea of regional chiefs that where there were not any, they tried to impose them. The Aba Riots of 1929 (Aba is in the heartland of the Ibo) were partly caused by resentment against the 'warrant chiefs,' men imposed as chiefs by the British but whom the people refused to accept. It was not difficult to impose measures on the Northerners, accustomed to implicit obedience, but it did not work in the East. The whole traditional structure of the East makes it virtually immune to dictatorship, one of the reasons for the present war. Easterners insist on being consulted in everything that concerns them. This assertiveness was hardly likely to endear itself to the colonial administrators and is one of the reasons why the Easterners came to be referred to as 'uppity.' By contrast the English loved the North... [with] the people obedient and undemanding. [11]

With the highest population density in Africa of over 440 per square mile, the modern Ibo, at least until Biafra was crushed, were the most enterprising in Africa; Biafra was the most developed country in Africa, with the highest per capita income and the best education. This is in sharp contrast with the state societies, which consist of servile peoples willing to go on subsisting under feudalism. Over the years, the British had seen to it by gerrymandering and favoritism that these feudal chieftains and emirs of the backward North would rule all the peoples within the arbitrarily established boundaries of Nigeria. It was a very unnatural union, to say the least, to combine such diverse peoples.

The Biafran Revolution began in early 1966 when a popular revolt deposed numerous corrupt politicians. Yet the parasitic classes of the state—its bureaucrats, police, hanger-ons, party hirelings, and contractors—continued to exist, and soon rallied under the banner of the politicians who, though not in power, had not been placed in detention. The old state, no longer shaken, was able to strike back, and began slaughtering Ibos living in the North. While initially it thought of secession, the Northern government later decided to take over the whole country. This was in response not only to the desire of the North to dominate the Ibo but also to pressure from British diplomats, who knew that a free Biafra would frustrate British neo-colonialism. As Chinua Achebe put it, "Biafra stands for true independence in Africa, for an end to the four hundred years of shame and humiliation which we have suffered in an association with Europe. Britain knows this and is using Nigeria to destroy

Biafra." [12]

In the face of mass murders by the henchmen of the corrupt politicians, the Biafran people seceded from the North. In May 1967 they issued a Declaration of Independence, which asserted in libertarian fashion that "you are born free and have certain inalienable rights which can best be preserved by yourselves" and that they were "unwilling to be unfree partners in any association of a political or economic nature." [13] Unlike the dictatorship in the North headed by Gowon, the Biafrans were led by Ojukwu, a man of the people and not a man of the State. Somewhat like the role of Makhno in the Ukraine in 1918-21, Ojukwu carried out the instructions of a Consultative Assembly composed of representatives from all the professions (no matter how "lowly") and all the localities. Ojukwu gave up a fortune and high political positions in the North by siding with the Biafran people, and it is little wonder that the popular masses gave him complete support. This is exemplified by the facts that the Biafran Army he led was completely voluntary, and that the Biafran people resisted invasion for years at very inferior technological levels.

The Biafrans won all the initial battles, and the Gowon dictatorship agreed to continue its invasion of the South only by pressure from British and U.S. imperialism, both of whom began giving Nigeria extensive military aid. It is no paradox that the struggling Biafran people were suppressed by a dictatorship propped up by three of the most statist societies of all time, the U.S., Britain, and the USSR, all of whom supplied Gowon with jets, recoilless rifles, advisors, and armoured cars. The strategy of Nigeria was best expressed by one of its leaders: "Starvation is a legitimate weapon of war, and we have every intention of using it against the rebels." [14] The imperialists agreed with this strategy; thus the British were directly responsible for the blockade of Biafra which led to mass famine, and the British government and the American State Department exerted massive pressure on the International Red Cross in Geneva to prevent them from sending aid to starving Biafran children. [15]

Fighting for their traditional freedom and against genocide stood the Biafran people. The masses willingly contributed everything they had to the army, from food and money to blunderbusses and shoes. It was a people's war in the true sense of the word. The people's army held out for years with virtually no weapons beyond rifles; ammunition was so low that the rule of thumb was to attack with five bullets and defend with two. Unlike in the North, there was not a riot or a mutiny of any kind. All these facts demonstrate that the spirit of a people with the will to freedom is almost invincible. While the Ibo were crushed by 1970, their anarchist traditions will never die and the day will come when they will again rise.

Part 3 of article will appear in next month's Abolitionist

Footnotes

1. Cf. Parmenas Gitendu Mockerie, *An African Speaks for His People* in Wilfred Cartey and Martin Kilson (eds.), *The African Reader* (NY: Random House, 1970), Vol. II, p. 102.
2. From Kenyatta's *Facing Mount Kenya* in Cartey and Kilson, pp. 19-28.
3. (NY and London: Monthly Review Press, 1966).
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 42-51.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 302-3.
7. Davidson, *A History of West Africa* (Garden City, NY), pp. 94-6. Thanks are due to Joseph Peden, publisher of *The Libertarian Forum*, for calling my attention to the libertarian tradition of the Ibo.

8. Margery Perham, *Native Administration in Nigeria* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1937), p. 231.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 234.

11. Forsyth, *The Biafra Story* (Baltimore: Penquin, 1969), pp. 15-17.

12. From a paper read in Uganda in 1968. Cartey and Kilson, p. 169.

13. Forsyth, p. 97

14. Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 217.

15. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 157 and 195-6.

DANKS—continued from page 4

a common enemy. Out of the meeting grew the Ad Hoc Committee for a Hawaiian Trustee. There also grew an increasing number of newly radicalized individuals. A formerly conservative retired Army colonel said, "If we have to take to the streets to demonstrate how articulate we have finally become, then let's do so. We can no longer tolerate being called insubordinate because we rose up to ask for what is rightfully ours."

In the weeks that followed, Kokua supported the Ad Hoc Committee at street rallies and other public demonstrations, but they let it be known that their support did not imply sanction of the committee's goal as an *ultimate* solution. They questioned the very existence of the Bishop Estate. Its role as an educator of Hawaiian children was a farce. It would serve the real interests of the people better if the estate was broken up and its lands, the many thousands of acres it controlled, were given to the people. Likewise, it would be better if the thousands of acres used for federal military reservations were also given to the people.

An interesting sidelight: the labor unions showed their true colors and supported the Takabuki appointment, in the face of the peoples' opposition.

Around the same time, it was learned that some 60 families living in Halawa were to be evicted from their property at the end of July so that the state could build a multi-million dollar sports stadium on the site. Again the people were aroused and again a militant group was formed, the Halawa Displaced Persons Committee. This is another issue that is sure to involve confrontation with the rulers, and sure to involve the participation of *Kokua Hawaii*.

Kokua has been active on the educational front, having organized a Third World conference at the University of Hawaii with representatives from the Young Lords, La Raza, Black Panthers, and I Wor Kuen (Chinese-American liberation). The major speeches from this conference were published in the Ethnic Studies Dept.'s quarterly *Hawaii Pono Journal*. [5] This magazine

continued from page 2

was scheduled to be held in Meriden on August 7th. AND THEN CAME THE BUST.

As I write this, I do not know if we will now be able to hold the CRR meeting at the Goldsmith's on the 7th. Neither do I know if Abby will be free to campaign for the CRR this fall.

I do know that there are those in the town of Meriden who want to see the Goldsmiths silenced as effective political and social revolutionists. It is not surprising that some cops, and some judges will step outside of their own laws, the better to carry on the real work of the State: the defense of the ruling class, its wealth, its mores, its life-style.

This also I know: WE MUST NOT LET THEM GET AWAY WITH IT!

At the present time we need money to help finance a strong legal defense of the Goldsmiths. We need money as well to get their story to the media. Frankly, Abby and Mike Goldsmith are two of our most active organizers. If we can't get up the money to defend our own people from the thugs of the state apparatus, how can we ever hope to obtain that beautiful free society we all dream about? If you won't chip in, who the hell will??

DROP THE CHARGES ON THE MERIDEN TWO!
FREE ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS!

(Make all checks payable to the *Abolitionist*) THE RADICAL
LIBERTARIAN DEFENSE FUND, BOX 14, VERONA, NEW
JERSEY 07044

is serving as the scholarly focal point of Hawaiian liberation, having published excellent recent articles on: land revisionism and details of the political-business tie-up that comprises the power elite [6], and Pearl Harbor revisionism [7], footnoting such sources as Tansill, Beard, Theobald, and William Henry Chamberlain's *America's Second Crusade* (dear to the hearts of libertarians.) *Kokua Hawaii* also has its own paper *Hulil* (overthrow) which is consistently hard-hitting and informative.

Readers of the *Abolitionist* should be interested in the response of the libertarian community to the Hawaiian movement. I detect three major strains of deviationism: 1) a right-wing political deviation that is critical of any law-breaking tactics (Leonard Read-ism), 2) a right-wing economic deviation that criticizes what they feel to be an attack on "private property" (ignoring the fact that such property was stolen in the first place, unjustly held now, and is manipulated by and for the statists,) and 3) a left-wing economic deviation that ostensibly supports the Hawaiians but which calls for greater "public" ownership of the land (ignoring the fact that such ownership is part of the problem since 49% of Hawaii is already owned publicly, i.e., by the government, and it has gotten the people nowhere.) The correct line is obviously *all land to the people*—private ownership of all property, regardless of whether the operational mode of that private ownership is individual, communal, syndical, or whatever.

I am reminded of the advice given to her people by the American Indian writer Rosalie Nichols, [8] "There are many working hard to destroy the concept of ownership. Our Indian claims are based on property rights. We own our Indian lands. If we help to destroy the concept and validity of property rights, we won't have a leg to stand on. Do not be misled by people just because they express sympathy for us or wish to identify with our culture."

The same advice holds true for the Hawaiians.

ALL LAND TO THE PEOPLE! NONE TO THE STATE!

ALL POWER TO THE PEOPLE! DEATH TO THE STATE!

Footnotes

1. Hawaii Dept. of Planning & Economic Development, *State of Hawaii Data Book: a statistical abstract* (1970), pp. 35-42.
2. Gavan Daws, *Shoal of Time* (1968), Lawrence Fuchs, *Hawaii Pono: a Social History* (1961), and Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom* (3 vol., 1938-67).
3. Jon J. Chinen, *The Great Mahele, Hawaii's Land Division of 1848*, (1958).
4. Daws.
5. Special Issue (April, 1971).
6. Pete Johnson, "The Inside of Housing: an Overall Perspective" Vol. I, no. 2 (Feb., 1971), pp. 18-36.
7. Wayne Hayashi, "Countering Our Pearl Harbor Mentality" *ibid.* pp. 46-59.
8. Rosalie Nichols, *Right-Wing Rationale for Non-Recognition of Indian Rights* (1970), p. 22.

THE ABOLITIONIST
PO BOX 14
VERONA, N.J. 07044



To:

FIRST
CLASS
MAIL!

Spooner
Letter
Service